

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3 – 17, 19 – 20, 22 – 27 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3 – 17, 19 – 20, 22 – 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horovitz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,409) in view of Wical (U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,545), and in further view of Nichols (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2003/0055652). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is first submitted that there is no motivation or suggestion in any of the cited prior art to combine them as the Examiner has done. The Examiner states that one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Nichols with Horovitz and Wical “to provide a flexibility of sharing information, document and storage.” It is respectfully submitted that Nichols is not art that would be found by such a motivation. Nichols provides a method for users to collaborate within one or more applications across a private network exchange, and is not instructive with regard to the efficiency, flexibility, or organization of data in a knowledge database. It is respectfully submitted that the addition of the Nichols reference in forming a new §103 rejection would not likely result from suggestions from any of these cited references. Instead, the use of Nichols appears to be only as a result of hindsight reasoning by the Examiner.

Applicants reiterate that the art cited by the Examiner, including the newly cited Nichols reference, fails to teach or suggest the present invention. One of the stated objectives of the present invention is to remedy the situation common in collaborative

work applications wherein users cannot effectively discern the certain factors of various technologies under development by other users. To accomplish this, a controlled lexicon is used to ascertain readiness (as an example of one factor) of various technologies being developed by users collaborating from different work areas on a certain project or platform. As the Examiner admits, Horovitz does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. The Examiner states that “Wical... discloses a knowledge catalog processor [which] accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology.” However, Wical only addresses a method of organizing data within a knowledge base. This is similar to the prior art described in the original Specification (see Specification, page 2, line 9 – page 3, line 12). Wical does not teach organizing technology-specific data in a controlled lexicon such that a common collaboration group can ascertain risk or other factors for specific projects. The Examiner’s addition of Nichols does not remedy this deficiency. As stated above, Nichols appears to disclose a method for users to collaborate on projects utilizing various work applications for information consolidation and document storage. Nichols simply does not contemplate stewards using a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific data to assess risk or other factors across a single project or platform.

Independent claim 1 calls for a “controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data... enabling individual stewards to populate a card catalog based on... technology-specific terminology data and based on collaboration input...” A similar limitation is called for in claim 25. This controlled lexicon enables a community of stewards, which may be widely distributed and represent vastly different job functions,

to assess certain status factors of various technologies being implemented across a particular project or platform. Accordingly, as Horovitz, Wical, and Nichols all fail to teach or suggest such a controlled lexicon, it is believed that independent claims 1 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Further, claims 3 – 17, 19 – 20, 22 – 24, 26, and 27 depend from claims 1 and 25, and are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons cited above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 25 Aug 2005

By: 

Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686  
Stephen T. Olson, Reg. No. 36,626

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/sdo